




*grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Plaintiff's objections do not demonstrate a basis for federal jurisdiction. Plaintiff continues to assert that she is seeking habeas corpus relief. The purpose of habeas corpus, however, is to grant relief from unlawful imprisonment or custody and "it cannot be used properly for any other purpose." *Pierre v. United States*, 525 F.2d 933, 936 (5th Cir. 1976). Habeas corpus cannot be utilized as a "springboard to adjudicate matters foreign to the question of the legality of custody." *Id.* Plaintiff does not allege that she is in custody and has not stated a viable basis for pursuing a habeas corpus claim. Additionally, she does not allege facts showing any other basis for federal jurisdiction.

Having conducted a de novo review of the record in this case and the Magistrate Judge's Report, the Court has determined that the Report of the Magistrate Judge is correct, and Plaintiff's objections are without merit. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report of the Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 8) as the opinion of the District Court. Plaintiff's claims are **DISMISSED** without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **2nd** day of **November, 2023**.

  
JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE